

Stochastic parameterization: towards a new view of weather and climate models

Article

Accepted Version

Berner, J., Achatz, U., Batte, L., Bengtsson, L., De La Camara, A., Christensen, H. M., Colangeli, M., Coleman, D. R. B., Crommelin, D., Dolaptchiev, S. I., Franzke, C. L. E., Friederichs, P., Imkeller, P., Jarvinen, H., Juricke, S., Kitsios, V., Lott, F., Lucarini, V., Mahajan, S., Palmer, T. N., Penland, C., Sakradzija, M., Von Storch, J.-S., Weisheimer, A., Weniger, M., Williams, P. D. and Yano, J.-I. (2017) Stochastic parameterization: towards a new view of weather and climate models. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 98 (3). pp. 565-588. ISSN 1520-0477 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00268.1> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/66937/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00268.1>

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00268.1>

Publisher: American Meteorological Society

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in

the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Stochastic Parameterization: Towards a new view of Weather and Climate Models

JUDITH BERNER*

National Center for Atmospheric Research⁺, Boulder, Colorado

ULRICH ACHATZ

Institut für Atmosphäre und Umwelt, Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

LAURIANE BATTÉ

CNRM-GAME, Météo-France/CNRS, Toulouse, France

LISA BENGTSSON

Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute, Norrköping, Sweden

ALVARO DE LA CÁMARA

National Center for Atmospheric Research Boulder, Colorado

HANNAH M. CHRISTENSEN

University of Oxford, Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics, Oxford

MATTEO COLANGELI

Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale F. Crispi 7, 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

DANIELLE R. B. COLEMAN

National Center for Atmospheric Research⁺, Boulder, Colorado

DAAN CROMMELIN

*CWI Amsterdam, the Netherlands and Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics,
University of Amsterdam*

* Corresponding author address: Judith Berner, NCAR, P.O.Box 3000, Boulder, CO 80303. E-mail: berner@ucar.edu

⁺ NCAR is sponsored by the National Science Foundation

22 STAMEN I. DOLAPTCHIEV
 23 *Institut für Atmosphäre und Umwelt, Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

24 CHRISTIAN L.E. FRANZKE
 25 *Meteorological Institute and Centre for Earth System Research and Sustainability (CEN),*
 26 *University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany*

27 PETRA FRIEDERICH
 28 *Meteorological Institute, University of Bonn, Germany*

29 PETER IMKELLER
 30 *Institut für Mathematik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany*

31 HEIKKI JÄRVINEN
 32 *University of Helsinki, Department of Physics, Helsinki, Finland*

33 STEPHAN JURICKE
 34 *University of Oxford, Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics, Oxford*

35 VASSILI KITSIOS
 36 *CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship, 107-121 Station St, Aspendale, Victoria 3195,*
 37 *AUSTRALIA*

38 FRANÇOIS LOTT
 39 *Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (CNRS/IPSU), Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris,*
 40 *France*

41 VALERIO LUCARINI
 42 *Meteorological Institute Centre for Earth System Research and Sustainability (CEN), University*
 43 *of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany; Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of*
 44 *Reading, Reading, UK*

45 SALIL MAHAJAN
 46 *Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA*

47 TIMOTHY N. PALMER

48 *University of Oxford, Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics, Oxford*

49 CÉCILE PENLAND

50 *Physical Sciences Division, NOAA/Earth System Research Laboratory, Boulder, Colorado*

51 MIRJANA SAKRADZIJA

52 *Max Planck Institute for Meteorology and Hans-Ertel Centre for Weather Research, Deutscher*
53 *Wetterdienst, Hamburg, Germany*

54 JIN-SONG VON STORCH

55 *Max-Planck Institute for Meteorology, Hamburg*

56 ANTJE WEISHEIMER

57 *National Centre for Atmospheric Science (NCAS), University of Oxford, Atmospheric, Oceanic*
58 *and Planetary Physics, Oxford, and ECMWF, Shinfield Park, Reading, UK*

59 MICHAEL WENIGER

60 *Meteorological Institute, University of Bonn, Germany*

61 PAUL D. WILLIAMS

62 *Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, Reading, UK*

63 JUN-ICHI YANO

64 *GAME-CNRM, CNRS, Météo-France, 42 Av. Coriolis, Toulouse, France*

65

66 **ABSTRACT**

67 The last decade has seen the success of stochastic parameterizations in short-term, medium-
68 range and seasonal forecasts: operational weather centers now routinely use stochastic
69 parameterization schemes to better represent model inadequacy and improve the quantification
70 of forecast uncertainty. Developed initially for numerical weather prediction, the inclusion of
71 stochastic parameterizations not only provides better estimates of uncertainty, but it is also
72 extremely promising for reducing longstanding climate biases and is relevant for determining
73 the climate response to forcing such as an increase of CO₂.

74 This article highlights recent developments from different research groups which show that the
75 stochastic representation of unresolved processes in the atmosphere, oceans, land surface and
76 cryosphere of comprehensive weather and climate models (a) gives rise to more reliable
77 probabilistic forecasts of weather and climate and (b) reduces systematic model bias.

78 We make a case that the use of mathematically stringent methods for the derivation of stochastic
79 dynamic equations will lead to substantial improvements in our ability to accurately simulate
80 weather and climate at all scales. Recent work in mathematics, statistical mechanics and
81 turbulence is reviewed, its relevance for the climate problem demonstrated, and future research
82 directions outlined.

83

84 **CAPSULE** (20-30 words)

85 Stochastic parameterizations - empirically derived, or based on rigorous mathematical and

86 statistical concepts - have great potential to increase the predictive capability of next generation

87 weather and climate models.

88

89 **1 The need for stochastic parameterizations**

90 Numerical weather and climate modeling is based on the discretization of the continuous
91 equations of motion. Such models can be characterized in terms of their dynamical core, which
92 describes the resolved scales of motion, and the physical parameterizations, which provide
93 estimates of the grid-scale effect of processes, that cannot be resolved. This general approach
94 has been hugely successful in that skillful predictions of weather and climate are now routinely
95 made (e.g. Bauer et al. 2015). However, it has become apparent through the verification of these
96 predictions that current state-of-the-art models still exhibit persistent and systematic
97 shortcomings due to an inadequate representation of unresolved processes.

98 Despite the continuing increase of computing power, which allows numerical weather and
99 climate prediction models to be run with ever higher resolution, the multi-scale nature of
100 geophysical fluids means that many important physical processes (e.g. tropical convection,
101 gravity wave drag, micro-physical processes) are still not resolved. Parameterizations of
102 sub grid-scale processes contain closure assumptions, and related parameters with inherent
103 uncertainties. Although increasing model resolution gradually pushes these assumptions
104 further down the spectrum of motions, it is realistic to assume that some form of closure
105 will be present in simulation models into the foreseeable future.

106 Moreover, for climate simulations, a decision must be made as to whether computational
107 resources should be used to increase the representation of sub grid physical processes or to build
108 a comprehensive Earth-System Model, by including additional climate components such as the
109 cryosphere, chemistry and biosphere. In addition, the decision must be made about whether
110 computational resources should go towards increased horizontal, vertical and temporal
111 resolution or additional ensemble members.

112 Additional challenges are posed by intrinsically coupled phenomena like the Madden-Julian
113 Oscillation (MJO) and tropical cyclones. These tropical multi-scale processes need to resolve
114 small-scale processes such as convection in addition to capturing the large-scale response and
115 feedback. Many of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project phase 5 (CMIP5) climate
116 models still do not properly simulate the MJO and convectively coupled waves (Hung et al.
117 2013).

118 Mathematical approaches to stochastic modeling rely on the assumption that a physical
119 system can be expressed in terms of variables of interest, and variables which one does not
120 want to explicitly resolve. In the mathematical literature this is usually referred to as the
121 operation of coarse graining and performed through the method of homogenization
122 (Papanicolaou and Kohler 1974, Gardiner 1985, Pavliotis and Stuart 2008). The goal is then
123 to derive an effective equation for the slow predictable processes and to represent the effect
124 of the now unresolved variables as random noise terms.

125 Such a thinking underlies the pioneering study of Hasselmann (1976), who split the coupled
126 ocean-atmosphere system into a slow ocean and fast weather fluctuation components and
127 subsequently derived an effective equation for the ocean circulation only. One finds that the
128 impact of the fast variables on the dynamics of the slow variables boils down to a
129 deterministic correction – a mean field effect sometimes referred to as noise-induced drift
130 or rectification – plus a stochastic component, which is a white random noise in the limit of
131 infinite time scale separation.

132 Many rigorous methods in subgrid-scale parameterization are based on the assumption of a scale
133 separation. Without a scale separation one needs to consider memory effects in the
134 parameterization scheme. Often, it is thought that traditional parameterizations require a gap in

135 the power spectrum between small (length) scale and large-scale processes, although this is not
136 necessary (see e.g. the discussion on scale-separation in Yano 2015). Many stochastic
137 parameterizations are based on the assumption of a scale separation between the temporal
138 decorrelation rates between the rapidly fluctuating processes represented by a white noise and
139 the slow processes of interest (e.g., Gardiner, 1985; Penland, 2003a). An example for a simple
140 red noise model that has scale separation in the temporal sense, but not a gap in the power
141 spectrum is discussed in DelSole (2000).

142 In geophysical applications, there is often - but not always – a relationship between spatial and
143 temporal scales of variability, with fast processes associated to small scales and slow processes
144 associated to large scales. If this is the case, separating physical processes by timescales can
145 result in decomposing small scale features from large scale phenomena and spatial and temporal
146 scale separation become equivalent.

147 A great challenge to both, the deterministic and stochastic approach, is posed by the
148 representation of partially resolved processes (either in the time or space domain). For
149 example, climate models and even many weather models split the fundamental process of
150 convection into a resolved (large-scale) and parameterized component (e.g. Arakawa 2004).
151 The equilibrium assumption no longer holds (e.g. Yano and Plant 2012a,b) and the subgrid-
152 scale parameterization takes a prognostic form rather than being diagnostic, as explicitly
153 shown for the mass-flux formulation by Yano (2014). The range of scales on which a
154 physical process is only partially resolved is often referred to as the “gray zone” (e.g.
155 Gerard 2007). As the next generation of numerical models attempts to seamlessly predict
156 weather as well as climate, there is an increasing need to develop parameterizations that
157 adapt automatically to different spatial scales (“scale-aware parameterizations”). A big

advantage of the mathematically rigorous approach is that the subgrid-model is valid for increasing spatial resolutions within a range of scales that is obtained as part of the derivation.

Stochastic parameterization schemes are now routinely used by operational weather and climate centers to make ensemble predictions from short-range to seasonal time scales (e.g., Berner et al. 2009, Weisheimer et al. 2014). Most ensembles suffer from underdispersion, which means that - on average - the observed state is more often outside the cone of forecasts than can be statistically justified. Stochastic perturbations introduce more diversity among the forecasts, which helps to ameliorate this problem and result in more skillful ensemble forecasts.

A fundamental argument, that has been often overlooked, is that the merit of stochastic parameterization goes far beyond providing uncertainty estimations for weather and climate predictions, but is also needed for better representing the mean state (e.g., Sardeshmukh et al. 2001, Palmer 2001) and regime transitions (e.g., Williams et al. 2003, 2004, Birner and Williams 2008, Christensen et al. 2015a) via inherent non-linear processes. This is especially relevant for climate predictions, which have long-standing mean state errors, such as e.g., a double intra-tropical convergence zone (e.g., Lin et al. 2007), and erroneous stratocumulus cloud covers, which play a crucial role in the climate response to external forcing.

Mechanisms how Gaussian zero-mean fluctuations can change the mean state have been discussed e.g. in Tompkins and Berner (2008) and Beena and von Storch (2009). The former study introduces perturbations to the humidity field. They find that positive perturbations are more likely to trigger a convective event than negative perturbations suppress convection. Beena and von Storch (2009) investigate the ocean response to fluctuating air-sea fluxes. They find that negative buoyancy anomalies are likely to trigger convection which in turn alters the existing

stratification, while positive anomalies sustain the existing stratification. Insofar as stochastic parameterizations can change the mean state, they have the potential to affect the response to changes in the external forcing (e.g., Seiffert and von Storch 2008). In mathematical terms, this is the question how a stochastic forcing affects the invariant measure of a deterministic dynamical system (Lucarini 2012) and how the climate response to such a forcing can be framed as a problem of non-equilibrium statistical mechanics (Colangeli et al. 2012, 2014, Lucarini and Sarno 2011, Lucarini et 2014a.).

The essential fact that a white-noise forcing with zero mean can lead to a non-linear or rectified response and change the mean state is shown in Figure 1. Assume the unforced nonlinear climate system can be simplified as a double-well potential (a). If the noise is sufficiently small (denoted by short red arrows) and under appropriate initial conditions, the system will stay in the deeper potential well and the associated probability density function of states will have a single maximum (b). As the amplitude of the noise increases (long arrows in c), the system can undergo a noise-induced transition and reach the secondary potential well. The resulting probability density function (PDF) will exhibit two local maxima (d), signifying two different climate regimes, rather than a single maximum, as in the small-noise scenario. Note, that the stochastic forcing not only changes the variance, but also the mean. But even a linear system characterized by a single potential when unforced can change the mean, if forced by multiplicative or state-dependent white noise (e-h). The noise is called “multiplicative”, if its amplitude is a function of the state, which is denoted by the red errors of different length in panel g. The noise-induced drift changes the single-well potential of the unforced system (e), so that the effective potential including the effects of the multiplicative noise has multiple wells (not shown) and the associated PDF becomes bimodal (h). Note, that in this example the shift in

the mean compared to the unforced PDF (f) is caused by the noise, which is referred to as “noise-induced drift” (see e.g., Sardeshmukh et al. 2001, Berner 2005, Berner et al. 2005, Sura et al. 2005).

Here, we argue, that stochastic parameterizations are essential for:

- Estimating uncertainty in weather and climate predictions
- Reducing systematic model errors
- Triggering noise-induced regime transitions
- Capturing the response to changes in the external forcing

and should be applied in a systematic and consistent fashion, not only to weather, but also to climate simulations.

Several studies have identified the assessment of the benefits of stochastic closure schemes as key outstanding challenge in the area of mathematics applied to the climate system (Palmer 2001, 2012, Palmer and Williams 2008, Williams et al. 2013). For accessible reviews of rigorous mathematical approaches applied to weather and climate, we refer to Penland (2003a,b), Majda et al. (2008) and Franzke et al. (2015). The current study focuses on recent successful applications of empirical and rigorous approaches to the subgrid-parameterization problem in weather and climate models.

2 Representing Uncertainty in Comprehensive Climate and Weather Models

2.1 Adding uncertainty a posteriori: the stochastically perturbed parameterization tendency scheme and the stochastic kinetic-energy backscatter scheme

Stochastic parameterizations are based on the notion that – as spatial resolution increases – the

225 method of averaging (Arnold 2001, Monahan and Culina 2011) is no longer valid and the
 226 subgrid-scale variability should be sampled rather than represented by the equilibrium mean. In
 227 addition, unrepresented interactions between unresolved subgrid-scale processes with the large-
 228 scale flow might affect the resolved dynamics.

229 The former is addressed by the stochastically perturbed parameterization tendency (SPPT)
 230 scheme, which perturbs the net tendencies of the physical process parameterizations
 231 (convection, radiation, cloud physics, turbulence and gravity wave drag). One essential feature
 232 for its success is that the noise is correlated in space and time. SPPT has a beneficial impact on
 233 medium range, seasonal and climate forecasts (Buizza et al. 1999, Teixeira and Reynolds 2008,
 234 Palmer et al. 2009, Weisheimer et al. 2014, Berner et al. 2015, Christensen et al. 2015b, Dawson
 235 and Palmer 2015, Batté and Doblas-Reyes 2015)

236 The stochastic kinetic-energy backscatter scheme (SKEBS) aims to represent model uncertainty
 237 arising from unresolved subgrid-scale processes and their interactions with larger scales by
 238 introducing random perturbations to the streamfunction and potential temperature tendencies.
 239 For this purpose, the scheme re-injects a small fraction of the dissipated energy into the resolved
 240 flow. Originally developed in the context of Large Eddy Simulations (LES; Mason and
 241 Thomson 1992), and applied to models of intermediate complexity (Frederiksen and Davies
 242 1997), it was adapted by Shutts (2005) for Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP). Its beneficial
 243 impact on weather and climate forecasts are reported e.g., in Berner et al. (2008, 2009, 2011,
 244 2012, 2015), Bowler et al. (2008, 2009), Palmer et al. (2009), Doblas-Reyes et al. (2009),
 245 Charron et al. (2010), Hacker et al. (2011), Tennant et al. (2011), Weisheimer et al. (2011,
 246 2014), Romine et al. (2015), Sanchez et al. (2015), albeit Shutts (2013) criticizes the arbitrary
 247 nature of some of the design features. Instead, he proposes a convective SKEBS (Shutts, 2015),

which introduces a phase relationship between flow and perturbations and adds additional perturbations to the divergent flow.

While these schemes are motivated by physical reasoning and scheme parameters are informed in some manner, for example by coarse-graining high-resolution output (Shutts and Palmer 2007, Shutts and Callado Pallarès 2014) or comparison with observations (Watson et al. 2015), the perturbations are essentially empirical constructs. For example, the amplitude of the perturbations is typically determined as the value that satisfactorily reduces the ensemble underdispersion. Obviously such an approach is only possible for forecast ranges where verification is possible, such as for short-term, medium-range and seasonal forecasts. A common criticism of this approach is that the improved skill is solely the result of the increase in spread. However, Berner et al. (2015) found that the merits of stochastic parameterization go beyond increasing spread and can account for structural model uncertainty.

In the following examples, we show recent results that demonstrate the potential of stochastic parameterizations to improve the mean state representation and variability as well as the skill of seasonal forecasts.

First, we present recent results from the seasonal forecasting system at ECMWF. In the simulations with stochastic parameterizations, excessively strong convective activity over the Maritime Continent and the tropical Western Pacific is reduced, leading to smaller biases in outgoing longwave radiation (Figure 2), cloud cover, precipitation and near-surface winds (Weisheimer et al. 2014). The stochastic schemes also lead to an increase in the frequency (Figure 3) and amplitude of MJO events. A reduction of excessive amplitudes

in westward propagating convectively coupled waves in an earlier model version is reported in Berner et al. 2012.

Another example of the positive impact of stochastic schemes is evident in climate simulations with the Community Earth System Model (CESM). Compared to observations, the modeled spectrum of average sea surface temperature in the Nino 3.4 region has three times more power for periods between 2 and 4 years (Figure 4). SPPT markedly reduces the temperature variability in this frequency range, leading to a much better agreement with nature (Christensen et al., 2016). Interestingly, in these examples the benefit of adding stochasticity consists of *reducing* excessive variability, which is a non-trivial response.

Along with the improvements of the model climate, stochastic perturbations also benefit probabilistic forecast performance on seasonal timescales. This has been reported in a number of studies using earlier versions of ECMWF's seasonal system (Berner et al. 2008, Dobles-Reyes et al. 2009, Palmer et al. 2009) and recently been confirmed in the newest version (Weisheimer et al. 2014) and in the EC-Earth system model (Batté and Doblas-Reyes 2015). Figure 5 shows ensemble mean and spread in forecasts for Nino 3.4 area sea-surface temperatures with the EC-Earth model, run at a standard horizontal resolution (SR, ca. 60km for the atmospheric and ca. 100km for the ocean component) and a high resolution (HR, ca. 40km for the atmospheric component and 25km for the ocean.) For both resolutions, the introduction of SPPT perturbations increases the ensemble spread. Furthermore, SPPT reduces the mean error in the standard resolution, but not as much as moving to a higher resolution.

A number of studies have found evidence for stochasticity leading to noise-induced transitions in mid-latitude circulation regimes, especially over the Pacific-North America

region (Jung et al. 2005, Berner et al. 2012, Dawson et al. 2015, Weisheimer et al. 2014).

These results suggest that stochastic parameterizations are also relevant for the prediction of low-frequency features (Berner et al. 2016).

2.2 Adding uncertainty a priori: perturbed parameter approaches for the atmospheric component

While the performance of the stochastic schemes discussed in the last section is undisputed, they have been criticized in that they are added *a posteriori* to models that have been independently developed and tuned. Ideally, stochastic perturbations should represent model uncertainty where it occurs. One obvious way to represent uncertainty at its source rather than *a posteriori* is the perturbed parameter approach, which perturbs the closure parameters in the physical process parameterizations. There are two variants: the parameter can be fixed throughout the integration, but vary for each ensemble member (e.g. Murphy et al. 2004, Hacker et al. 2011a) or vary randomly with time (e.g. Bowler et al. 2008, 2009). Strictly, the first variant is not a stochastic parameterization, but an example for a multi-model, since each ensemble member has a different climatology. However, since stochastic parameter perturbations are routinely compared to fixed-parameter schemes, this section discusses both.

While perturbed-parameter ensembles typically outperform unperturbed ensemble system on weather timescales, they typically cannot sufficiently account for all deficiencies in the spread (Hacker et al. 2011, Reynolds et al. 2011, Christensen et al. 2015b) and do not lead to the same reliability as the *a posteriori* schemes discussed above (Berner et al. 2015).

Here, an ensemble system considered statistically reliable when a predicted probability for a particular event (e.g. temperature exceeding 17°C) compares well with the observed

frequencies. Another limitation of this approach is that the parameter uncertainty estimates are subjective, and information about parameter interdependencies is not included.

The following studies are examples for applications of the perturbed-parameter approach to physical process parameterizations and perturbing the interface between different model components. We start with results pertaining to perturbations in the atmospheric component and move to those of other model components, such as land and ocean models, which are especially relevant for climate applications.

A number of studies report on improved skill due to parameter perturbations to boundary layer and convection schemes (Hacker et al. 2011, Reynolds et al. 2011). Recently, a stochastic "eddy-diffusivity/ mass-flux" parameterization has been developed, (Suselj et al. 2014), which combines an eddy-diffusivity component with a stochastic mass-flux scheme. The resulting scheme unifies boundary layer and shallow convection and was operationally implemented in the operational Navy Global Environmental Model.

Christensen et al. (2015b) used an objective covariance estimate of parameter uncertainty (Järvinen et al. 2012, Ollinaho et al. 2013) for four convection closure parameters and developed both a fixed-parameter and a stochastically varying perturbation scheme. Both schemes improved the forecast skill of the ensemble prediction system, with a larger impact observed for the fixed perturbed parameter scheme (Figure 6, bottom). In addition, for some variables such as wind at 850hPa, the schemes lead to a reduction in bias (Figure 6, top).

Recently, a body of work proposes stochastic approaches for another atmospheric parameterization, namely non-orographic gravity waves (Lott et al. 2012, Lott and Guez 2013, and de la Cámara and Lott 2015). Observational studies indicate that the gravity wave field is very intermittent and only predictable in a statistical sense. Recently, de la Cámara et al. (2014)

informed the free parameters of the stochastic gravity-wave scheme using momentum flux measurements.

2.3 Uncertainty in land surface, ocean and coupled component models

Physical parameters of land surface models are often not well constrained by observations. A recent study by MacLeod et al. (2015) introduced parameter perturbations to two key soil parameters, and compared their impact with stochastic perturbations of the soil moisture tendencies in seasonal forecasts with the ECMWF coupled model. Both the perturbed parameter approach and the stochastic tendency perturbations improved the forecasts of extreme air temperature for the European heat wave of 2003, through better representation of negative soil moisture anomalies and the upward sensible heat flux.

Another source of uncertainty in land models stems from the land surface heterogeneity, which impacts the surface heat fluxes in coupled models. The effect of representing variability associated with land surface heterogeneity in vegetation has been investigated by Langan et al. (2014). This stochastic parameterization retains the subgrid variability among different plant functional types rather than using constant area weights for the computation of the surface heat fluxes. First results with a single column model version of CESM reveal an increase in the variability as well as larger extreme values in convective precipitation (Figure 7).

The coupled atmosphere-ocean system is very sensitive to fluctuations in the fluxes between its component models. Air-sea fluxes of buoyancy, energy, and momentum vary on a vast range of space and time scales, including scales that are too small or fast to be explicitly resolved by global climate models. For example, convective clouds in the atmosphere will cause subgrid fluctuations at the air-sea interface, in both the downward fresh water flux (through precipitation) and the downward short-wave solar radiation. The response of the climate to

stochastic perturbations of the air-sea buoyancy flux is studied by Williams (2012) in a coupled atmosphere-ocean model. The response is complex and involves changes to the oceanic mixed-layer depth, sea-surface temperature, atmospheric Hadley circulation, and fresh water flux across the sea surface (Figure 8). These findings suggest that the lack of representation of stochastic subgrid variability in air-sea fluxes may contribute to some of the biases exhibited by contemporary coupled climate models.

Since the buoyancy effects in the ocean are different from that in the atmosphere, the length scale at which rotational effects become as important as gravity wave effects (also called the Rossby deformation radius) is much smaller. Consequently, mesoscale eddies in state-of-the art ocean models are still far from being resolved and are usually represented by traditional bulk parameterizations (Gent and McWilliams 1990, Redi 1982). A recent study by Li and von Storch (2013) computes the contributions from the mean and fluctuating component of heat flux divergence in a high-resolution ocean model. The magnitude of the fluctuations is about one order of magnitude larger than the mean component (Figure 9) suggesting that classical parameterization significantly underestimate the total eddy flux. The fluctuating part, even though having zero mean, can play an important role in generating large-scale low-frequency variations and in shaping the mean oceanic circulation.

Juricke et al. (2013) and Juricke and Jung (2014) recently investigated the sensitivity of an ocean-sea ice model to variations in the ice strength parameter. As this parameter is not observable, large uncertainties remain in the choice of its value, although it is very important for modeling sea ice drift. Varying this parameter stochastically results in changes to the mean sea ice distribution as well as sea ice spread. Compared to perturbations of the atmospheric initial conditions, the incorporation of additional stochastic ice strength perturbations leads to

considerably more sea ice spread in the central Arctic (Figure 10), which is a better match with the observed uncertainties (Juricke et al. 2014).

2.4 Data Assimilation and Extreme Events

The purpose of data assimilation is to combine observations with short term model-forecasts to come up with a gridded and physically consistent estimate of the state of the atmosphere, also called “analysis”. One particular approach is to use ensemble forecasts as the first guess fields. As such, ensemble data assimilation inherits the shortcomings of short-term ensemble predictions, namely, the underdispersiveness in the spread. Recent work has demonstrated that the stochastic parameterizations that are beneficial for ensemble prediction, can also improve the mean analysis (Isaksen et al. 2007, Houtekamer et al. 2009, Mitchell and Gottwald 2012, Hamill and Whitaker 2011, Ha et al. 2015, Romine et al. 2015). In particular, Ha et al. 2015 showed that the benefits of including a stochastic parameterization go beyond a larger number of observations passing quality control due to an increased spread. A cutting-edge frontier is the use of memory effects in Kalman filter data assimilation schemes (O’Kane and Frederiksen 2012).

The impact of stochastic perturbations on extremes has only been considered very recently. Most works focus on a description of non-Gaussian subgrid-scale processes (Majda et al. 2009, Sardeshmukh and Sura 2009, Sura 2011, Sardeshmukh et al. 2015). Franzke (2012) showed that his reduced stochastic model (see next section) captures the extremes of the full model. Tagle et al. (2015) were the first to study the effect of the stochastic parameterizations in a comprehensive climate model. They found that the stochastic parameterizations had a big impact on the surface temperature mean and variability, but hardly changed the tail behavior. This might be in part due to the fact that their stochastic schemes use Gaussian perturbations.

3 Systematic mathematical and statistical physics approaches

This section introduces systematic mathematical and statistical physics approaches to the parameterization problem and reports on recent work on the application of these rigorous methods to the weather and climate system.

3.1. Mathematical and Numerical implications of stochasticity

Although the motions of the atmosphere and ocean are described by the Navier-Stokes equation, large-scale flows can often be modeled under hydrostatic approximation. This leads to the deterministic primitive equation system. If we want to represent continuous small-scale fluctuations as stochastic terms, these equations need to be generalized to allow for stochasticity. A relevant mathematical field is thus the extension of the derivation to the stochastic primitive equations for two-dimensional (Ewald et al. 2007; Glatt-Holtz and Ziane 2008; Glatt-Holtz and Temam 2011) and three-dimensional flows (Debussche et al. 2012).

Moreover, stochastic systems require calculi and numerical schemes fundamentally different from the ones available to solve deterministic systems. The two most commonly used stochastic integral types are the Itô-integral (Itô 1951) and the Stratonovich-integral (Stratonovich 1966). When the fast processes of a continuous system are modeled by white noise – as is common for physical applications - the resulting stochastic model converges to a Stratonovich stochastic differential equation (Wong and Zakai 1965, Papanicolaou and Kohler 1974, Gardiner 1985, Penland 2003a,b). Discrete systems converge to the Itô stochastic differential equation. Starting in the 1970s a solid framework of numerical methods for stochastic ordinary differential equations was developed (Rümelin 1982,

Kloeden and Platen 1992, Milstein 1995, Kloeden 2002). However, this has been extended to high-order schemes only recently (Jentzen and Kloeden 2009, Weniger 2014). With stochastic parameterizations becoming more common in weather and climate simulations, a revision of the deterministic numerical schemes should be undertaken to ensure the convergence of the numerical solutions.

3.2 Homogenization and stochastic mode reduction

Numerical weather and climate modeling can be seen as a model reduction problem. Because we cannot numerically solve the full continuous equations, we have to truncate the equations at some scale and then treat the unresolved processes in some smart way. A systematic approach for the derivation of reduced order models from first principles is performed through the method of homogenization or adiabatic elimination (Wong and Zakai 1965, Khas'minskii 1966, Kurtz 1973, Papanicolaou and Kohler 1974, Pavliotis and Stuart 2008). The fundamental idea is to decompose the state vector into slow and fast components, represent the fast processes by a stochastic term and derive analytically an effective equation for the slow, predictable modes. Majda et al. (1999) and Majda et al., 2001 expanded this body of work by making additional assumptions on the nonlinear self-interaction of the fast modes and coined the term “stochastic mode reduction”.

The stochastic mode reduction has been demonstrated to successfully model regime-behavior and low-frequency variability for conceptual models of the atmosphere (Majda et al. 2003), the barotropic vorticity (Franzke et al. 2005) and a quasi-geostrophic three-layer model on the sphere with realistic orography (Franzke and Majda 2006). However, due to both, the shear amount of analytical derivation and the compute-memory requirement in the numerical implementation of the resulting equations, the stochastic mode reduction cannot be easily

applied to comprehensive climate models of arbitrary complexity. A possible way forward is to apply the stochastic mode reduction locally at each gridpoint rather than globally (Dolaptchiev et al. (2013 a,b).

These mathematical techniques are rigorously valid only in the limit of large time-scale separation, although some studies report good empirical results, even when this condition is not, or only partly met (Dozier and Tappert 1978a,b , Majda et al. 2003 2008, Franzke et al. 2005, Franzke and Majda 2006). When the time scale separation between the fast and slow processes is not too large, the picture of the parameterization as being constructed as the sum of a suitably defined deterministic plus random corrections has to be amended to take memory effects into account (e.g. Zwanzig 2001, Chekroun et al. 2015a,b). Unfortunately, the condition of scale separation is typically not met in geophysical fluid dynamics applications (Sardeshmukh and Penland 2015, Yano 2015, Yano et al. 2015) that poses limitations to the application of homogenization. An alternative, which does not make any assumptions about time scale separation and provides an explicit expression for the terms responsible for the memory effect is proposed by Wouters and Lucarini (2012, 2013), who, instead, assume the presence of a weak dynamical coupling between the fast and the slow scales of motion.

The question of which stochastic process is best suited to describe the nonlinear interactions of the unresolved processes is an open question. While methods for Gaussian diffusion processes are well known (Oppenheim 1975) it may be the case that other formulations like Lévy processes are better suited to describe the underlying physics (Penland and Ewald 2008, Penland and Sardeshmukh 2012, Hein et al. 2010, Gairing and Imkeller 2012, 2013, Thompson et al. 2015).

3.3 Adaptation of Concepts from Statistical Physics to Weather and Climate

The scale-aware representation of convection and clouds on high-resolution grids (1-50 km) has been a long-standing challenge for weather and climate models. Within a single model column, convection is not uniquely determined by the resolved-scale processes, and the distribution of possible realizations of subgrid-scale convection highly depends on model resolution. Thus, to achieve scale-awareness, it is necessary to represent scale-dependent convective fluctuations about the ensemble average response. In addition, because of the lack of time-scale separation, a correct representation of convection across scales requires memory of subgrid-states from previous time steps.

A novel approach to represent the fluctuations in an ensemble of deep convective clouds adapts concepts from statistical mechanics (Craig and Cohen 2006). Based on this theory, a stochastic parameterization of deep convection was developed to represent fluctuations of the subgrid convective mass flux about statistical equilibrium (Plant and Craig 2008). This is especially attractive for variable-resolution grids, since the statistics automatically adapt to the grid-resolution. This approach was extended to shallow convective clouds by introducing a memory effect arising from the correlation between the cloud mass fluxes and cloud lifetimes (Sakradzija et al. 2015). Figure 11 shows histograms of the subgrid cloud-base mass flux in the stochastic shallow cumulus cloud scheme and coarse-grained large-eddy simulation at different horizontal resolutions. The histograms match closely and are scale-aware.

3.4 Modeling convective processes by Markov chains and cellular automata

Another way to introduce temporal memory and nonlocal effects is the use of Markov chains and cellular automata. A Markov chain is a mathematical system that undergoes transitions from one *discrete* state to another and the probabilities associated with the various state changes are called transition probabilities. If observational data or high-

499 resolutions simulations are used to inform the transition probabilities, the Markov chains
500 are called data-driven.

501 An example for this approach is the “stochastic convective parameterization” which
502 describes the convective state of the entire model column as a discrete Markov chain.
503 (Khouider et al. 2010, Dorrestijn et al. 2013a,b, Gottwald et al. 2015). The system can only
504 reside in a few distinct convective states - clear sky, congestus, deep convection, stratiform
505 and shallow - and the random transitions from one state to another evolve as a Markov
506 chain. The horizontal domain of the numerical model is covered with a high-resolution
507 lattice (with typical lattice spacing of 100m to 1000m), and on each lattice node lives a
508 copy of the discrete stochastic process for the convective state (Figure 12). By averaging
509 over blocks of lattice nodes, convective area fractions and related quantities can be obtained
510 for spatial domains of arbitrary size. The resulting patterns and temporal behavior of the
511 area fractions are quite realistic. Furthermore, the formulation on a high-resolution lattice
512 (or microlattice) makes it possible to compute convective fractions for varying area sizes,
513 so that a parameterization based on these fractions is scale-adaptive.

514 The probabilities for transitions between the convective states can be obtained in different
515 ways. Khouider et al. (2010) and Frenkel et al. (2012) use physical insight to formulate
516 transition probabilities for the Markov chain model, Dorrestijn et al. (2013a,b, 2015) and
517 Gottwald et al. (2015) estimate the transition probabilities from convection-resolving LES,
518 following a method proposed by Crommelin and Vanden-Eijnden (2008). Peters et al.
519 (2013) use observations for their estimates, which notably differ from those based on
520 physical intuition.

A related approach are cellular automata which are often used as simple mathematical models to simulate spatial self-organizational behavior such as convective organization. A cellular automaton describes the evolution of discrete states on a lattice grid. The states are updated according to a set of rules based on the states of neighboring cells at the previous time step. In addition to memory, cellular automata can allow for lateral communications between neighboring grid boxes and thus introduce spatial correlations.

The idea of using cellular automata within NWP was first proposed by Palmer (2001) and first applications used them as a quasi-stochastic pattern generator for SKEBS (Shutts 2005, Berner et al. 2008). Bengtsson et al. (2013) pioneered the use of a cellular automaton for the parameterization of convection. In traditional single-column parameterizations there is no treatment of horizontal transports of heat, moisture or momentum due to convection. To determine if the inclusion of lateral communication is beneficial, Bengtsson et al. (2013) considered a two-way interaction between cellular automata and the traditional convection parameterization. The cellular automaton evolves on a lattice with finer grid spacing than the parent model and is randomly seeded in regions where CAPE exceeds a threshold. The rules are linked to the updraft area fraction and large-scale wind. The scheme has been shown to enhance the organization of convective squall-lines (Bengtsson et al. 2013) and improves the skill of accumulated precipitation in a high-resolution ensemble prediction system (Bengtsson and Körnich 2015).

3.5 Climate Response in the presence of small-scale fluctuations

While there is extensive work focusing on the response of the climate system to changes in the external forcing, either natural - such as the forcing from a localized tropical heating as it occurs in Nino - or anthropogenic - such as the forcing from increased greenhouse gases,

544 little attention has been given to the fact if and how the representation of the subgrid-scale
545 can alter that response. In the mathematical community, this is the topic of response theory
546 and the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (e.g., Marconi et al. 2008, Lacorata and Vulpiani
547 2007, Colangeli et al. 2011, Lucarini and Colangeli 2012, Colangeli and Lucarini 2014).

548 Seiffert and von Storch (2008) were the first to investigate the response of a climate model
549 to CO₂-forcing in the presence of subgrid-scale fluctuations in atmospheric temperature,
550 divergence and vorticity. In their model, the strength of the global warming due to a CO₂-
551 doubling is altered by up to 15% near the surface and up to 25% in the upper troposphere
552 (Figure 13) depending on the exact representation of the small-scale fluctuations. Applying
553 a stochastic model to their simulations, they found that the small-scale fluctuations change
554 the temperature response via a statistical damping that acts as a restoring force. In addition,
555 the small-scale fluctuations can affect feedback and interaction processes that are directly
556 coupled to an increase in CO₂, thereby altering the CO₂-related radiative forcing (Seiffert
557 and von Storch 2010).

558 The fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) is concerned with the response of a system to
559 small changes in the forcing. In particular, it tries to relate the response to the natural
560 fluctuations in the system (Kubo 1966, Deker and Haake 1975, Hänggi and Thomas 1977,
561 Leith 1975, Risken 1984). In the atmospheric sciences, the FDT-operator is estimated from
562 model output, in particular the variances and covariances of the state variables at different
563 time lags. The so obtained empirical linear model is able to predict the response to changes
564 in the external forcing, such as signature from localized tropical heat forcing (Gritsun and
565 Branstator 2007, Gritsun et al. 2008).

Achatz et al. (2013) argue that subgrid-scale parameterizations developed for a present day climate, might no longer be accurate in a changing climate. They use the FDT to adjust the subgrid-scale representation of the forced system. Figure 14 shows that a low-order model with a subgrid-scale parameterization corrected by the FDT yields a better response in the streamfunction variance than without the correction.

While some success of FDT-techniques to low-frequency climate modeling has been demonstrated, some of the mathematical assumptions are not strictly met. Recent work has expanded the mathematical underpinning by a more general formulation of the response theory better suited for non-equilibrium systems (Ruelle 2009, Lucarini and Sarno 2011), and is able to deliver climate projections using GCMs (Lucarini et al. 2014, Ragone et al. 2015).

3.6 Statistical Dynamical Closure Theory

Kraichnan (1959) first illustrated that renormalization of the statistical equations of fluid motion can be used to produce self-consistent parameterizations of the subgrid turbulent processes. It is on this basis that Frederiksen and Davies (1997) developed stochastic parameterisations of subgrid turbulence in barotropic atmospheric simulations on the sphere. The subgrid parameterisations consist of drain, backscatter and net eddy viscosities, which are determined from the statistics of higher resolution closure simulations.

Implementation of this approach into an atmospheric GCM resulted in significantly improved circulation and energy spectra (Frederiksen et al. 2003). These ideas were further formulated and tested by Frederiksen (1999, 2012a,b), and O’Kane and Frederiksen (2008). Frederiksen and Kepert (2006) then used the functional form of these closure approaches to develop a zero-parameter stochastic modeling framework, where the eddy viscosities are determined from higher resolution reference simulations. This is in contrast to typical

approaches in which heuristic subgrid parameterizations are developed based on some physical hypothesis on the behavior of subgrid turbulence. This approach was successfully applied to baroclinic geophysical simulations in Zidikheri and Frederiksen (2009, 2010a,b). Recently, Kitsios et al. (2012, 2013) used the approach of Frederiksen and Kepert (2006) to determine the eddy viscosities from a series of reference atmospheric and oceanic simulations. The isotropized version of the subgrid eddy viscosities were then characterized by a set of scaling laws. Large Eddy Simulations with subgrid models defined by these scaling laws (solid lines in Figure 15) were able to reproduce the statistics of the high resolution reference simulations (dashed lines in Figure 15) across all resolved scales. These scaling laws further enable the subgrid parameterizations to be utilized more widely as they remove the need to generate the subgrid coefficients from a reference simulation.

Concluding Remarks

In this article, we attempt to narrow the gap between the fields of numerical meteorological models and applied mathematics in the development of stochastic parameterizations: on the one hand geo-scientists are often unaware of mathematically rigorous results that can aid in the development of physically relevant parameterizations, on the other hand mathematicians often do not know about open issues in scientific applications that might be mathematically tractable. Over the last decade or two, increasing evidence has pointed to the potential of this approach, albeit applied in an *ad hoc* manner and tuned to specific applications. This is apparent in the choices made at operational weather centers, where stochastic parameterization schemes are now routinely used to represent model inadequacy better and improve probabilistic forecast skill. Here, we revisit recent work that demonstrates that stochastic parameterization are not only essential for the estimation of the uncertainty in

612 weather forecasts, but are also necessary for accurate climate and climate change
613 projections. Stochastic parameterizations have the potential to reduce systematic model
614 errors, trigger noise-induced regime transitions, and modify the response to changes in the
615 external forcing.

616 Ideally, stochastic parameterizations should be developed alongside the physical
617 parameterization and dynamical core development and not tuned to yield a particular model
618 performance, as is current practice. This approach is hampered by the fact that parameters
619 in climate and weather are typically adjusted (“tuned”) to yield the best mean state and/or
620 the best variability. This can result in compensating model errors, which pose a big
621 challenge to model development in general, and stochastic parameterizations in particular.

622 A stochastic parameterization might improve the model from a process perspective, but its
623 decreased systematic error no longer compensates other model errors, resulting in an
624 overall larger bias (Palmer and Weisheimer 2011, Berner et al. 2012). Clearly, such
625 structural uncertainties need to be addressed in order to improve the predictive skills of our
626 models.

627 Mathematically rigorous approaches decompose the system-at-hand into slow and fast
628 components. They focus on the accurate simulation of the large, predictable scales, while only
629 the statistical properties of the small, unpredictable scales need to be captured. One finds that the
630 impact of the fast variables on the dynamics of the slow variables boils down to a deterministic
631 correction plus a stochastic component. This immediately points to the fact that the classical
632 parameterization approach, which is only based upon averaged properties, is insufficient.

633 Understanding the deterministic correction term in physical terms will shed light on the impact
634 of stochastic parameterizations on systematic model errors and, hopefully, compensating model

errors.

Recent findings from such rigorous derivations suggest that when the time scales of the processes we need to parameterize are not very different from those of the explicitly resolved dynamics – if we are in a grey zone - memory terms can become important. This is especially relevant for developing scale-aware parameterizations, where it is difficult to control the time scale separation as the spatial resolution is altered.

Of course, the stochastic approach is not a panacea for the subgrid-scale parameterization problem and persistent model biases. Stochastic approaches must complement developments in the deterministic physical process parameterizations and dynamical core. Nevertheless, it is our conviction, that basing stochastic parameterizations on sound mathematical and statistical physics concepts will lead to substantial improvements in our understanding of the Earth system as well as increased predictive capability in next generation weather and climate models.

Acknowledgements

The idea for this article was conceived at the workshop on “Stochastic Parameterisation in Weather and Climate Models” held at the Meteorological Institute, University of Bonn, Germany, September 16-19, 2013. We thank the Meteorological Institute for hosting the workshop and the Volkswagenstiftung for financial support. We thank four anonymous reviewers for the insightful comment, which greatly improved the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Achatz, U., U. Löbl, S. I. Dolaptchiev, and A. Gritsun, 2013: Fluctuation–dissipation supplemented by nonlinearity: A climate-dependent subgrid-scale parameterization in low-order climate models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **70**, 1833–1846.
- Arakawa, A., 2004: The Cumulus Parameterization Problem: Past, Present, and Future. *J. Climate*, **17**, 2493–2525.
- Arnold, L., 2001: Hasselmann's program revisited: the analysis of stochasticity in deterministic climate models. In *Stochastic Climate Models*, Birkhäuser, Imkeller and von Storch, eds. Pp. 141–157.
- Batté L. and Doblas-Reyes, 2015: Stochastic atmospheric perturbations in the EC-Earth3 global coupled model: impact of SPPT on seasonal forecast quality *Climate Dynamics* 45:3419–3439. DOI 10.1007/s00382-015-2548-7
- Bauer, P., Thorpe, A., and Brunet, G., 2015: The quiet revolution of numerical weather prediction. *Nature*, **525**, 47–55.
- Bengtsson, L., M. Steinheimer, P. Bechtold, and J.-F. Geleyn, 2013: A stochastic parametrization for deep convection using cellular automata, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, **139**, 1533–1543
- Bengtsson, L., Körnich, H., 2015: Impact of a stochastic parameterization of cumulus convection, using cellular automata, in a meso-scale ensemble prediction system. Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society. DOI: 10.1002/qj.2720
- Beena, B. S. and J.-S. Von Storch, 2009: Effects of fluctuating daily surface fluxes on the time- mean oceanic circulation. *Climate dynamics*, **33**, 1–18.
- Berner, J , H. Christensen and D. Coleman, 2016: “Impact of stochastic parametrization in the Earth System Community Model”, to be submitted to J. Clim.
- Berner, J., F. J. Doblas-Reyes, T. N. Palmer, G. Shutts, and A. Weisheimer, 2008: Impact of a quasi-stochastic cellular automaton back- scatter scheme on the systematic error and seasonal prediction skill of a global climate model. Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, **366A**, 2561–2579.
- Berner, J., 2005: Linking nonlinearity and non-Gaussianity of planetary wave behavior by the Fokker–Planck equation. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **62**, 2098–2117.
- Berner, J., and G. Branstator, 2007: Linear and nonlinear signatures in the planetary wave dynamics of an AGCM: Probability Density Functions. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **64**, 117–136.
- Berner, J., S.-Y. Ha, J. P. Hacker, A. Fournier, and C. Snyder, 2011: Model uncertainty in a mesoscale ensemble prediction system: Stochastic versus multi-physics representations. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **139**, 1972–1995.
- Berner, J, T. Jung, and T. N. Palmer, 2012: Systematic model error: The impact of increased horizontal resolution versus improved stochastic and deterministic parameterizations. *J. Climate*, **25**, 4946–4962.

694 Berner, J., K. R. Smith, S.-Y. Ha, J. Hacker and C. Snyder, 2015: Increasing the skill of
695 probabilistic forecasts: Understanding performance improvements from model-error
696 representations, *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 143, 1295–1320.

697 Birner, T. and Williams, P. D., 2008: Sudden stratospheric warmings as noise-induced
698 transition. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 65(10), 3337–3343.

699 Buizza, Roberto, M. Miller, and T. N. Palmer, 1999: Stochastic representation of model
700 uncertainties in the ECMWF ensemble prediction system. *QJR Meteorol. Soc.*, 125, 2887–
701 2908.

702 Bowler N.E., A. Arribas, K.R. Mylne, K. B. Robertson, S.E. Beare, 2008: The MOGREPS
703 short-range ensemble prediction system. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 134, 703 – 722

704 Bowler, N. E., A. Arribas, S. E. Beare, K. R. Mylne, and G. J. Shutts, 2009. The local
705 ETKF and SKEB: Upgrades to the MOGREPS short-range ensemble prediction
706 system. *QJR Meteorol. Soc.*, 135, 767–776.

707 de la Cámara, A., F. Lott, and A. Hertzog, 2014: Intermittency in a stochastic
708 parameterization of nonorographic gravity waves, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 119, 11,905–
709 11,919, doi:10.1002/2014JD022002.

710 de la Cámara, A., and F. Lott, 2015: A parameterization of gravity waves emitted by fronts
711 and jets, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42, 2071–2078, doi:10.1002/2015GL063298.

712 Charron, M., G. Pellerin, L. Spacek, P. L. Houtekamer, N. Gagnon, H. L. Mitchell, and L.
713 Michelin, 2010: Toward random sampling of model error in the Canadian Ensemble
714 Prediction System. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 138, 1877–1901.

715 Chekroun, M., Liu, H., and Wang, S., 2015: Approximation of Stochastic Invariant
716 Manifolds: Stochastic Manifolds for Nonlinear SPDEs I, Springer Briefs in Mathematics

717 Chekroun, M., Liu, H., and Wang, S., 2015: Approximation of Stochastic Invariant
718 Manifolds: Stochastic Manifolds for Nonlinear SPDEs II, Springer Briefs in Mathematics

719 Crommelin, Daan, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden, 2008: Subgrid-scale parameterization with
720 conditional Markov chains. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 65.8: 2661–2675.

721 Christensen, H., J. Berner, D. Coleman and T. N. Palmer, 2016: “Stochastic parametrisation
722 and the El Nino-Southern Oscillation”, submitted to *J. Clim.*

723 Christensen, H. M., Moroz, I. M. and Palmer, T. N., 2015a: Simulating weather regimes:
724 impact of stochastic and perturbed parameter schemes in a simple atmospheric model.
725 *Climate Dynamics* 44, 2195–2214.

726 Christensen, H. M., Moroz, I.M., Palmer, T.N., 2015b: Stochastic and perturbed parameter
727 representations of model uncertainty in convection parameterization. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 72, 2525–
728 2544.

729 Colangeli, M., L. Rondoni and A. Verderosa, 2014: Focus on some nonequilibrium issues,
730 *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 64, 2

731 Colangeli, M., L. Rondoni, A. Vulpiani, 2012: Fluctuation-dissipation relation for chaotic
732 non-Hamiltonian systems, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp.* L04002

733 Colangeli, M., C. Maes and B. Wynants, 2011: A meaningful expansion around detailed
734 balance, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 095001.

735 Colangeli M. and V. Lucarini, 2014: Elements of a unified framework for response
736 formulae, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp.* P01002

737 Craig, G. C. and B. G. Cohen, 2006: Fluctuations in an equilibrium convective ensemble, part I:
738 Theoretical formulation. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **63**, 1996–2004.

739 Dawson, A. and T. N. Palmer, 2015: Simulating weather regimes: Impact of model
740 resolution and stochastic parameterization. *Climate Dynamics*, **44**, 2177–2193.

741 Debussche, A., N. Glatt-Holtz, R. Temam, and M. Ziane, 2012: Global Existence and Regularity
742 for the 3D Stochastic Primitive Equations of the Ocean and Atmosphere with Multiplicative
743 White Noise. *Nonlinearity*, **25**.

744 Deker, U., and F. Haake, 1975: Fluctuation-dissipation theorems for classical processes.
745 *Phys. Rev.*, **11A**, 2043–2056

746 DelSole, T., 2000: A fundamental limitation of Markov models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **157**, 2158–2168.

747 Doblas-Reyes, F. J., et al. 2009: Addressing model uncertainty in seasonal and annual
748 dynamical ensemble forecasts. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, **135**, 1538–1559.

749 Dolaptchiev, S., U. Achatz, and I. Timofeyev, 2013a: Stochastic closure for local averages in the
750 finite-difference discretization of the forced burgers equation. *Theoretical and Computational*
751 *Fluid Dynamics*, **27**, 297–317.

752 Dolaptchiev, S. I., I. Timofeyev, and U. Achatz, 2013b: Subgrid-scale closure for the inviscid
753 Burgers-Hopf equation. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, **11**, 757–777.

754 Dorfman, J. R., 1999: *An introduction to chaos in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics* (No.
755 14). Cambridge University Press.

756 Dorrestijn, J., Crommelin, D. T., Biello, J. A., and Böing, S. J., 2013a: A data-driven multi-
757 cloud model for stochastic parametrization of deep convection. *Philosophical Transactions*
758 *of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **371**, 20120374.

759 Dorrestijn, J., D. T. Crommelin, A. P. Siebesma, and H. J. J. Jonker, 2013b: Stochastic
760 parameterization of shallow cumulus convection estimated from high-resolution model
761 data, *Theoretical and Computational Fluid Dynamics*, **27**

762 Dorrestijn, J., D. T. Crommelin, A. P. Siebesma, H. J. J. Jonker and C. Jakob, 2015:
763 Stochastic parameterization of convective area fractions with a multcloud model inferred
764 from observational data. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **72**, 854–869.

765 Dozier, L. B., and F. D. Tappert, 1978a: Statistics of normal mode amplitudes in a random
766 ocean. I. Theory. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **63**, 353–365.

767 Dozier, L. B., and F. D. Tappert, 1978b: Statistics of normal mode amplitudes in a random
768 ocean. II. Computations. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **64**, 533–547.

769 Español, P., 1998: Stochastic differential equations for non-linear hydrodynamics, *Physica*
770 *A*, **248**, 77–96.

771 Eckermann, S. D., 2011: Explicitly stochastic parameterization of nonorographic gravity
 772 wave drag, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 68, 1749–1765.

773 Ewald, B., M. Petcu, and R. Temam, 2007: Stochastic Solutions of the Two-Dimensional
 774 Primitive Equations of the Ocean and Atmosphere with an Additive Noise. *Analysis and*
 775 *Applications*, 5, 183.

776 Franzke C., 2012: Predictability of extreme events in a non-linear stochastic-dynamical
 777 model. *Phys Rev E*, 85, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.85.031134.

778 Franzke, C. and A. J. Majda, 2006: Low-order stochastic mode reduction for a prototype
 779 atmospheric GCM. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 63, 457–479.

780 Franzke, C., A. J. Majda, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, 2005: Low-order stochastic mode reduction
 781 for a realistic barotropic model climate. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 62, 1722–1745.

782 Franzke, C. L., T. J. O’Kane, J. Berner, P. D. Williams, and V. Lucarini, 2015: Stochastic
 783 climate theory and modeling. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 6, 63–78.

784 Frederiksen, J. S., 1999: Subgrid-scale parameterizations of eddy-topographic force, eddy
 785 viscosity and stochastic backscatter for flow over topography. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56, 1481–1493.

786 Frederiksen, J. S. 2012a: Self-energy closure for inhomogeneous turbulence and subgrid
 787 modeling. *Entropy*, 14, 769–799.

788 Frederiksen, J. S. 2012b: Statistical dynamical closures and subgrid modeling for
 789 inhomogeneous QG and 3D turbulence. *Entropy*, 14, 32–57.

790 Frederiksen, J. S. and A. G. Davies, 1997: Eddy viscosity and stochastic backscatter
 791 parameterizations on the sphere for atmospheric circulation models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 54, 2475–
 792 2492.

793 Frederiksen, J. S., M. R. Dix, and A. G. Davies, 2003: The effects of closure-based eddy
 794 diffusion on the climate and spectra of a GCM. *Tellus*, 55, 31–44.

795 Frederiksen, J. S., M. R. Dix, and S. M. Kepert, 1996: Systematic energy errors and tendency
 796 toward canonical equilibrium in atmospheric circulation models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 53, 887–904.

797 Frederiksen, J. S. and S. M. Kepert, 2006: Dynamical subgrid-scale parameterizations from
 798 direct numerical simulations. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 63, 3006–3019.

799 Frenkel, Yevgeniy, Andrew J. Majda, and Boualem Khouider. 2012: Using the stochastic
 800 multcloud model to improve tropical convective parameterization: A paradigm example. *J.*
 801 *Atmos. Sci.*, 69, 1080–1105.

802 Gairing, J. and P. Imkeller, 2012: Power variations of heavy tailed jump diffusions in
 803 paleoclimatic time series. *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts*, volume 14, 11612.

804 Gairing, J. M. and P. Imkeller, 2013: Stable clts and rates for power variation of α -stable Levy
 805 processes. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 1–18.

806 García, A.L., and C. Penland, 1991: Fluctuating Hydrodynamics and Principal Oscillation
 807 Pattern Analysis, *J. Stat. Phys.*, 64, 1121–1132.

808 Gardiner, C. W., 1985: *Handbook of Stochastic Methods for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural*
 809 *Sciences*. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 442 pp.

810 Gent, Peter R., and James C. McWilliams. Isopycnal mixing in ocean circulation
811 models. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* 20.1 (1990): 150-155.

812 Gerard, L. 2007: An integrated package for subgrid convection, clouds and precipitation
813 compatible with meso-gamma scales. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.* 133, 711–730.

814 Gaspard, P. 2005: *Chaos, scattering and statistical mechanics* (Vol. 9). Cambridge
815 University Press.

816 Glatt-Holtz, N. and R. Temam, 2011: Pathwise Solutions of the 2-D Stochastic Primitive
817 Equations. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 63, 401–433.

818 Glatt-Holtz, N. and M. Ziane, 2008: The Stochastic Primitive Equations in Two Space
819 Dimensions with Multiplicative Noise. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 10, 801–822.

820 Gottwald, G.A., K. Peters and L. Davies (2015), A data-driven method for the stochastic
821 parametrisation of subgrid-scale tropical convective area fraction. *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, DOI:
822 10.1002/qj.2655

823 Gritsun, A. S, and G. Branstator, 2007: Climate response using a three-dimensional operator
824 based on the fluctuation–dissipation theorem. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 64, 2558–2575.

825 Gritsun, A. S, Branstator, G., and A. Majda, 2008: Climate response of linear and quadratic
826 functionals using the fluctuation–dissipation theorem. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 65, 2824–2841

827 Ha, S.-Y., J. Berner, and C. Snyder, 2014: Model error representation in mesoscale WRF-
828 dart cycling. *Monthly Weather Review* 2015, doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-14-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-14-00395.1)
829 [00395.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-14-00395.1)

830 Hacker JP, Snyder C, Ha S-Y, Pocernich M (2011) Linear and non-linear response to parameter
831 variations in a mesoscale model. *Tellus*, 63A, 429-444, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0870.2010.00505.x.

832 Houtekamer, P. L., H. L. Mitchell and X. Deng, 2009: Model error representation in an
833 operational ensemble Kalman filter. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 137, 2126–2143,
834 doi:10.1175/2008MWR2737.1

835 Hänggi, P., and H. Thomas, 1977: Time evolution, correlations and linear response of non-
836 Markov processes. *Z. Phys.*, 26B, 85–92.

837 Hasselmann, K., 1976: Stochastic Climate Models. Part I: Theory. *Tellus*, 28, 473–485.

838 Hein, C., P. Imkeller, and I. Pavlyukevich, 2010: Limit theorems for p-variations of solutions of
839 SDES driven by additive stable Le´vy noise and model selection for paleo-climatic data. *Recent*
840 *Development in Stochastic Dynamics and Stochastic Analysis*, 8, 137–150.

841 Horsthemke, W. and R. Lefever, 1984: *Noise-induced transitions*. Springer Verlag, Berlin
842 Heidelberg New York, 318 pp.

843 Hung, M.-P., Lin, J.-L., Wang, W., Kim, D., Shinoda, T. and Weaver, S.J. 2013. MJO and
844 convectively coupled equatorial waves simulated by CMIP5 climate models. *Journal of Climate*
845 26: 6185-6214

846 Itô, K., 1944: Stochastic integral. *Proceedings of the Imperial Academy*, 20, 519–524,
847 doi:10.3792/pia/1195572786.URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3792/pia/1195572786> Itô, K., 1951: On
848 Stochastic Differential Equations. *American Mathematical Society, New York*, 4, 1–51.

849 Järvinen H, Laine M, Solonen A, Haario H (2012) Ensemble prediction and parameter
850 estimation system: The concept. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 138, 281 – 288. doi:
851 10.1002/qj.923.

852 Jentzen, A. and P. E. Kloeden, 2009: The Numerical Approximation of Stochastic Partial
853 Differential Equations. *Milan J. Math.*, vol. 77 no. 1, 205–244, doi:10.1007/s00032-009-0100-0.

854 Jung, Thomas, T. N. Palmer, and G. J. Shutts. Influence of a stochastic parameterization on
855 the frequency of occurrence of North Pacific weather regimes in the ECMWF
856 model. *Geophysical research letters* 32.23 (2005).

857 Juricke, S. and T. Jung, 2014: Influence of stochastic sea ice parameterization on climate and the
858 role of atmosphere-sea ice-ocean interaction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 372, 20130283

859 Juricke, S., H. F. Goessling, and T. Jung, 2014: Potential sea ice predictability and the role of
860 stochastic sea ice strength perturbations. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 8396–8403,

861 Juricke, S., P. Lemke, R. Timmermann, and T. Rackow, 2013: Effects of stochastic ice strength
862 perturbation on arctic finite element sea ice modeling. *Journal of Climate*, 26.

863 Khas'minskii, R. Z., 1966: A limit theorem for the solutions of differential equations with
864 random right-hand sides. *Theory Prob. and App.*, 11, 390-406.

865 Khouider, B., J. Biello, and A. J. Majda, 2010: A stochastic multicloud model for tropical
866 convection. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 8, 187-216.

867 Kitsios, V., J. S. Frederiksen, and M. J. Zidikheri, 2012: Subgrid model with scaling laws for
868 atmospheric simulations. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 69, 1427–1445.

869 Kitsios, V., J. S. Frederiksen, and M. J. Zidikheri, 2013: Scaling laws for parameterisations of
870 subgrid eddy-eddy interactions in simulations of oceanic circulations. *Ocean Model*, 68, 88–105.

871 Kloeden, P. E., 2002: The systematic derivation of higher order numerical schemes for
872 stochastic differential equations. *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 70, 187–207.

873 Kloeden, P. E. and E. Platen, 1992: *Numerical Solutions of Stochastic Differential Equation*.
874 Springer Verlag, Berlin, 636 pp.

875 Kraichnan R. H, 1959: The structure of isotropic turbulence at very high Reynolds number.
876 *J Fluid Mech.*, 5, 497-543.

877 Kubo, R., 1966: The fluctuation-dissipation theorem, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 29, 255-284.

878 Kurtz, T. G., 1973: A limit theorem for perturbed operator semi-groups with applications to
879 random evolutions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 12, 55–67.

880 Lacorata, G. A. Vulpiani., 2007: Fluctuation-Response Relation and modeling in systems with
881 fast and slow dynamics, *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, 14, 681–694

882 Landau, L.D., and E.M. Lifshitz, 1959: *Fluid Mechanics*, Pergamon Press.

883 Leith, C. E, 1975: Climate response and fluctuation dissipation. *J. Atmos. Sci.* 32, 2022-2026

884 Li, H. and J.-S. von Storch, 2013: On the fluctuations of buoyancy fluxes simulated in a 1/10
885 degree ogcm. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 43.

886 Lin, J.L., 2007: The Double-ITCZ Problem in IPCC AR4 Coupled GCMs: Ocean–
887 Atmosphere Feedback Analysis. *J. Climate*, **20**, 4497–4525.

888 Langan, R., Archibald, R., Plumlee, M., Mahajan, S., Ricciuto, D., Yang, C., ... and Fu, J.
889 S. (2014). Stochastic Parameterization to Represent Variability and Extremes in Climate
890 Modeling. *Procedia Computer Science*, 29, 1146-1155.

891 Lott, F., L. Guez, and P. Maury, 2012: A stochastic parameterization of non-orographic
892 gravity waves: Formalism and impact on the equatorial stratosphere, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*,
893 39, L06807, doi:10.1029/2012GL051001.

894 Lott, F., and L. Guez, 2013: A stochastic parameterization of the gravity waves due to
895 convection and its impact on the equatorial stratosphere, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118,
896 8897-8909, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50705.

897 Louis, J.-F., 1979: A parametric model of vertical eddy fluxes in the atmosphere. *Bound.-*
898 *Layer Meteor.*, **17**, 1876-202, doi 10.1007/BF00117978.

899 Lucarini, V., 2012: Stochastic perturbations to a dynamical system: a response theory approach,
900 *J. Stat. Phys.* 146, 774-786

901 Lucarini, V and M. Colangeli, 2012: Beyond the Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem: The role
902 of Causality, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theor. Exp.* P05013

903 Lucarini, V. and S Sarno, 2011: A statistical mechanical approach for the computation of the
904 climatic response to general forcings. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 18, 7-28

905 Lucarini, V., Faranda, D., Wouters, J., and Kuna, T. 2014a Towards a General Theory of
906 Extremes for Observables of Chaotic Dynamical Systems. *J. Stat. Phys.* 154, 723-750.

907 Lucarini, V., R Blender, C Herbert, F Ragone, S Pascale, J Wouters, 2014b: Mathematical
908 and physical ideas for climate science, *Reviews of Geophysics* 52 (4), 809-859

909 Majda, A.J., Gershgorin, B., and Y. Yuan, 2010: Low frequency climate response and
910 fluctuation–dissipation theorems: Theory and practice. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 67, 1186–1201.

911 MacLeod, D., H. L. Cloke, F. Pappenberger and A. Weisheimer (2015): Improved seasonal
912 prediction of the hot summer of 2003 over Europe through better representation of uncertainty in
913 the land. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, doi:10.1002/qj.2631.

914 Majda, A. J, C. Franzke and D. Crommelin, 2009: Normal forms for reduced stochastic climate
915 models. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, doi:10.1073/pnas.0900173106.

916 Majda, A. J., C. Franzke, and Boualem Khouider, 2008: An applied mathematics
917 perspective on stochastic modelling for climate. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
918 *Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 366.1875: 2427-
919 2453.

920 Majda, A., I. Timofeyev, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, 2003: Systematic strategies for stochastic
921 mode reduction in climate. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 60, 1705–1722.

922 Majda, A. J., I. Timofeyev, and Vanden-Eijnden, 1999: Models for Stochastic Climate
923 Prediction. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 96, 14687–14691.

924 Majda, A. J., I. Timofeyev, and Vanden-Eijnden, 2001: A Mathematical Framework for

925 Stochastic Climate Models. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 54, 891–974.

926 Marconi, U.M.B, A. Puglisi, L. Rondoni, A. Vulpiani, 2008: Fluctuation–dissipation:
927 Response theory in statistical physics, *Physics Reports* 461, 111–195.

928 Mason, P. J. and Thomson, D. J., 1992: Stochastic backscatter in large-eddy simulations of
929 boundary layers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 242, 51–78.

930 Milstein, G. N., 1995: *Numerical integration of stochastic differential equations*, volume 313.
931 Springer.

932 Mitchell L, Gottwald GA. Data assimilation in slow-fast systems using homogenized
933 climate models. *J Atmos Sci* 2012, 69:1359–1377.

934 Monahan, A., and J. Culina, 2011: Stochastic averaging of idealized climate models. *J.*
935 *Climate*, **24**, 3068–3088.

936 O’Kane, T. J. and J. S. Frederiksen, 2008: Statistical dynamical subgrid-scale parameterizations
937 for geophysical flows. *Phys. Scr.*, T132, 014033.

938 O’Kane T.J., Frederiksen J.S., 2012: The application of statistical dynamical turbulence
939 closures to data assimilation. *Phys. Scr.*, T142, 014042.

940 Ollinaho P, Laine M, Solonen A Haario H, Järvinen H (2013) NWP model forecast skill
941 optimization via closure parameter variations. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 139, 1520 – 1532.
942 doi: 10.1002/qj.2044.

943 Oppenheim, A., 1975: Schafer rw: Digital signal processing. *Englewood Clifis, N.J.: Prentice-*
944 *Hall*.

945 Palmer, T. N. 2012, Towards the probabilistic Earth-system simulator: a vision for the future of
946 climate and weather prediction. *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 138: 841–861. doi: 10.1002/qj.1923

947 Palmer, T. N., 2001: A nonlinear dynamical perspective on model error: A proposal for non-
948 local stochastic-dynamic parameterization in weather and climate prediction. *Quart. J. Roy.*
949 *Meteor. Soc.*, 127, 279–304.

950 Palmer, T. N., R. Buizza, F. Doblas-Reyes, T. Jung, M. Leutbecher, G. Shutts, M. Steinheimer,
951 and A. Weisheimer, 2009: Stochastic Parametrization and Model Uncertainty. *ECMWF*
952 *Technical Memorandum*, 598, available at <http://www.ecmwf.int/publications/>.

953 Palmer, T. N., and A. Weisheimer, 2011. Diagnosing the causes of bias in climate models–
954 why is it so hard? *Geophysical & Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics* 105.2–3, 351–365.

955 Palmer, T. N. and Williams, P. D., 2008: Introduction. Stochastic physics and climate
956 modeling. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 366, 2421–2427.

957 Papanicolaou, G., and W. Kohler, 1974: Asymptotic theory of mixing ordinary stochastic
958 differential equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **27**, 641–668.

959 Pavliotis, G. A. and A. M. Stuart, 2008: Multiscale methods, volume 53 of Texts in Applied
960 Mathematics, Springer, New York, NY

961 Penland, C., 2003a: Noise out of chaos and why it won’t go away. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 84,
962 921–925.

963 Penland, C., 2003b: A stochastic approach to nonlinear dynamics: A review (electronic
964 supplement to 'noise out of chaos and why it won't go away'). *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 84,
965 ES43–ES51.

966 Penland, C. and B. Ewald, 2008: On Modelling Physical Systems with Stochastic Models:
967 Diffusion versus Lévy Processes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A:*
968 *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 366, 2455–2474.

969 Penland, C. and P. D. Sardeshmukh, 2012: Alternative interpretations of power-law distributions
970 found in nature. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 22, 023119.

971 Peters, K., Jakob, C., Davies, L., Khouider, B., & Majda, A. J. (2013). Stochastic behavior
972 of tropical convection in observations and a multicloud model. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 70, 3556–
973 3575.

974 Plant, R. S. and G. C. Craig, 2008: A stochastic parameterization for deep convection based on
975 equilibrium statistics. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 65, 87–105.

976 Ragone, F., V. Lucarini, F. Lunkeit, 2015: A new framework for climate sensitivity and
977 response: a modeling perspective, *Clim. Dyn.*, doi: 10.1007/s00382-015-2657-3

978 Redi, M. H., 1982: Oceanic isopycnal mixing by coordinate rotation. *JPO*, 12, 1154–1158

979 Reynolds CA, Ridout JA, McLay JG, 2011: Examination of parameter variations in the
980 U.S. Navy global ensemble. *Tellus*, 63A, 841 – 857.

981 Risken, H., 1984: The Fokker-Plank Equation: Methods of Solution and Applications. Springer-
982 Verlag, 474 pp.

983 Ruelle, D., 2009: A review of linear response theory for general differentiable dynamical
984 systems. *Nonlinearity*, **22**, 855–870.

985 Ruelle, D., 2012: Hydrodynamic turbulence as a problem in nonequilibrium statistical
986 mechanics. *PNAS*, **109**, 20344–20346.

987 Ruelle., D., 2014: Non-equilibrium statistical mechanics of turbulence. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **157**, 205–
988 218.

989 Romine, G. S., C. S. Schwartz, J. Berner, K. R. Smith, C. Snyder, J. L. Anderson, and M. L.
990 Weisman, 2014: Representing forecast error in a convection-permitting ensemble system.
991 *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **142**, 4519–4541.

992 Rümelin, W., 1982: Numerical Treatment of Stochastic Differential Equations. *SIAM J.*
993 *Numer. Anal.*, **19**, 604–613.

994 Sakradzija, M., A. Seifert, and T. Heus, 2015: Fluctuations in a quasi-stationary shallow
995 cumulus cloud ensemble. *Nonlin. Processes Geophys.*, **22**, 65–85.

996 Sanchez, C., Williams, K. D. and Collins, M. (2015), Improved stochastic physics schemes for
997 global weather and climate models. *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*.. doi: 10.1002/qj.2640

998 Sardeshmukh, P., C. Penland, and M. Newman, 2001: *Rossby waves in a fluctuating medium.*
999 *Progress In Probability, Vol 49: Stochastic Climate Models*. P. Imkeller, and J.-S. von Storch,
1000 eds., Birkäuser Verlag, Basel, 369–384, 369–384 pp.

1001 Sardeshmukh, P.D., and P. Sura 2009: Reconciling non-Gaussian climate statistics with linear

1002 dynamics. *J. Climate*, **22**, 1193-1207.

1003 Sardeshmukh, P.D., and C. Penland, 2015: Understanding the distinctively skewed and
 1004 heavy tailed character of atmospheric and oceanic probability distributions. *Chaos*, **25**,
 1005 036410, doi: 10.1063/1.4914169

1006 Sardeshmukh, P.D., G.P. Compo, and C. Penland, 2015: Need for caution in interpreting extreme
 1007 weather statistics. *J. Climate*, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0020.1>.

1008 Schumacher, J., J.D. Scheel, D. Krasnov, D.A. Donzis, V. Yakhot, and K.R. Sreenivasan, 2014:
 1009 Small-scale universality in fluid turbulence. *PNAS*, 10961-10965.

1010 Seiffert, R. and J.-S. von Storch, 2008: A stochastic analysis of the impact of small-scale
 1011 fluctuations on the tropospheric temperature response to CO₂ doubling. *Journal of Climate*, **23**,
 1012 2307–2319.

1013 Seiffert, R. and J.-S. von Storch, 2010: A stochastic analysis of the impact of small-scale
 1014 fluctuations on tropospheric temperature response to CO₂ doubling. *J. Climate*, **23**, 2307-
 1015 2319.

1016 Shutts, G., 2015, A stochastic convective backscatter scheme for use in ensemble prediction
 1017 systems. *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, doi: 10.1002/qj.2547

1018 Shutts, G, 2005: A kinetic energy backscatter algorithm for use in ensemble prediction systems.
 1019 *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 3079-3102.

1020 Shutts, G. J., 2013. Coarse graining the vorticity equation in the ECMWF integrated
 1021 forecasting system: The search for kinetic energy backscatter. *Journal of the Atmospheric*
 1022 *Sciences*, **70**(4), 1233-1241.

1023 Shutts, G., T. Allen, and J. Berner, 2008: Stochastic parameterization of multiscale processes
 1024 using a dual-grid approach. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical,*
 1025 *Physical and Engineering Sciences*, **366**, 2623–2639.

1026 Shutts, G. J., and T. N. Palmer, 2007: Convective forcing fluctuations in a cloud-resolving
 1027 model: Relevance to the stochastic parameterization problem. *Journal of climate*, **20**, 187-
 1028 202.

1029 Shutts, G. and A. Callado Pallarès, 2014: Assessing parameterization uncertainty associated
 1030 with horizontal resolution in numerical weather prediction models. *Philosophical*
 1031 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering*
 1032 *Sciences* **372**.2018, 20130284.

1033 Stratonovich, R., 1966: A new representation for stochastic integrals and equations. *SIAM*
 1034 *Journal on Control*, **4**, 362–371.

1035 Sura P., 2011: A general perspective of extreme events in weather and climate. *Atmos. Res.*,
 1036 **101**, 1–21.

1037 Sura, P., M. Newman, C. Penland, and P. Sardeshmukh, 2005: Multiplicative noise and
 1038 non-Gaussianity: A paradigm for atmospheric regimes? *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **62**, 1391-1409.

1039 Suselj, K., J. Teixeira, D. Chung, 2013: A Unified Model for moist-convective boundary
 1040 layers based on a stochastic eddy-diffusivity/ mass-flux parameterization. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **70**,
 1041 1929-1953.

1042 Suselj, K., T.F. Hogan, J. Teixeira, 2015: Implementation of a stochastic eddy-diffusivity/
 1043 mass flux parameterization into the Navy Global Environmental Model. *Weather and*
 1044 *Forecasting*, **29**, 1374–1390.

1045 Tagle, F., J. Berner, M. D. Grigoriu, N. M. Mahowald, G. Samorodnitsky, 2015:
 1046 Temperature Extremes in the Community Atmosphere Model with Model Error
 1047 Representation, *J. Clim.*, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0314.1>

1048 Tennant, W.J., et al, 2011: Using a stochastic kinetic energy backscatter scheme to
 1049 improve MOGREPS probabilistic forecast skill, *Monthly Weather Review*, 139, 1190–1206.

1050 Teixeira J., and C. Reynolds, 2008: Stochastic nature of physical parameterizations in
 1051 ensemble prediction: A stochastic convection approach. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, 136, 483–496.

1052 Thompson, W.F., R.A. Kuske, A.H. Monahan, 2015: Stochastic averaging of dynamical
 1053 systems with multiple time scales forced with a-stable noise. *Multiscale Interactions*, in
 1054 press.

1055 Tompkins, A. M., and J. Berner, 2008: A stochastic convective approach to account for
 1056 model uncertainty due to unresolved humidity variability. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1057 *Research: Atmospheres* 113.D18

1058 Watson, P. A. G., H. M. Christensen, and T. N. Palmer, 2015: Does the ECMWF IFS
 1059 Convection Parameterization with Stochastic Physics Correctly Reproduce Relationships
 1060 between Convection and the Large-Scale State? *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 72(1), 236–242.

1061 Weniger, M., 2014: Stochastic Parameterization: A Rigorous Approach to Stochastic Three-
 1062 Dimensional Primitive Equations. *Bonner Meteorologische Abhandlungen*, 64.

1063 Weisheimer, A., S. Corti, T.N. Palmer and F. Vitart (2014): Addressing model error
 1064 through atmospheric stochastic physical parameterisations: Impact on the coupled ECMWF
 1065 seasonal forecasting system. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, **372**, 201820130290, doi:
 1066 10.1098/rsta.2013.0290

1067 Weisheimer, A., T. N. Palmer, and F. J. Doblas-Reyes. 2011: Assessment of
 1068 representations of model uncertainty in monthly and seasonal forecast
 1069 ensembles. *Geophysical Research Letters* 38.16 (2011).

1070 Williams, P. D., Read, P. L. and Haine, T. W. N., 2003: Spontaneous generation and impact
 1071 of inertia–gravity waves in a stratified, two-layer shear flow. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
 1072 30(24), article number 2255.

1073 Williams, P. D., Haine, T. W. N. and Read, P. L., 2004: Stochastic resonance in a nonlinear
 1074 model of a rotating, stratified shear flow, with a simple stochastic inertia–gravity wave
 1075 parameterization. *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*, 11(1), 127–135.

1076 Williams, P. D., 2005: Modelling climate change: the role of unresolved processes.
 1077 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 363(1837), 2931–2946.

1078 Williams, P. D., 2012: Climatic impacts of stochastic fluctuations in air–sea fluxes. *Geophysical*
 1079 *Research Letters*, 39, article number L10705.

1080 Williams, P. D., Cullen, M. J. P., Davey, M. K. and Huthnance, J. M., 2013: Mathematics
 1081 applied to the climate system: outstanding challenges and recent progress. *Philosophical*

1082 *Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 371(1991), article number 20120518.
 1083 Wouters, J. and V. Lucarini, 2012: Disentangling multi-level systems: averaging, correlations
 1084 and memory. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2012, P03003.
 1085 Wouters, J. and V. Lucarini, 2013: Multi-level Dynamical Systems: Connecting the Ruelle
 1086 Response Theory and the Mori-Zwanzig Approach, *J. Stat. Phys.* 151, 850-860.
 1087 Yano, J.-I., 2014: Formulation structure of mass-flux convection parameterization. *Dyn.*
 1088 *Atmos. Ocean*, 67, 1-28
 1089 Yano, J.-I., 2015: Scale separation. *Parameterization of Atmospheric Convection*, Volume I
 1090 (R. S. Plant and J. I. Yano, Eds.), World Scientific, Imperial College Press, 73-99.
 1091 Yano, J.-I. and R. S. Plant, 2012a: Convective quasi-equilibrium. *Rev. Geophys.*, 50,
 1092 RG4004, doi:10.1029/2011RG000378.
 1093 Yano, J.-I. and R. S. Plant, 2012b: Interactions between shallow and deep convection under
 1094 a finite departure from convective quasi-equilibrium. *JAS*, 69, 3463-3470.
 1095 Yano, J.-I., L. Bengtsson, J.-F. Geleyn, and R. Brozkova, 2015: Towards a unified and self-
 1096 consistent parameterization framework. *Parameterization of Atmospheric Convection*,
 1097 Volume II (R. S. Plant and J. I. Yano, Eds.), World Scientific, Imperial College Press, 423-
 1098 435.
 1099 Zidikheri, M. J. and J. S. Frederiksen, 2009: Stochastic subgrid parameterizations for
 1100 simulations of atmospheric baroclinic flows. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 66, 2844–2858.
 1101 Zidikheri, M. J. and J. S. Frederiksen, 2010a: Stochastic modelling of unresolved eddy
 1102 fluxes. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.*, 104, 323–348.
 1103 Zidikheri, M. J. and J. S. Frederiksen, 2010b: Stochastic subgrid-scale modelling for non-
 1104 equilibrium geophysical flows. *Phil. T. Roy. Soc. A*, 368, 145–160.
 1105 Zwanzig R, 2001 Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics, Oxford University Press
 1106
 1107

LIST OF FIGURES

1109	Figure 1: System characterized by a,c) double-potential or e,g) single-potential well and	
1110	their associated probability density functions (PDFs). If the noise is sufficiently small	
1111	(a) and under appropriate initial conditions, the system will stay in the deeper potential	
1112	well and the associated probability density function of states will have a single	
1113	maximum (b). As the amplitude of the noise increases, the system can undergo a	
1114	noise-transition and reach the secondary minimum in the potential (c) leading to a	
1115	shifted mean and increased variance in the associated probability density function (d).	
1116	A linear system characterized by a single potential well and forced by additive white	
1117	noise (e) will have a unimodal PDF. However, when forced by mutliplicative (state-	
1118	dependent) white noise (g), the noise-induced changes the single-well potential of the	
1119	unforced system, so that the effective potential including the effects of the	
1120	multiplicative noise has multiple wells and the associated PDF becomes bimodal (h).	
1121	41
1122	Figure 2: Top of the atmosphere net longwave radiation (outgoing longwave radiation;	
1123	OLR) in W m^{-2} in DJF. Left: <i>stochphysOFF</i> –ERA-Interim reanalysis, middle:	
1124	System 4–reanalysis, right: System 4 – <i>stochphysOFF</i> . Significant differences at the	
1125	95% confidence level based on a two-sided <i>t</i> -test are hatched. From Weisheimer et al.	
1126	(2014).	42
1127	Figure 3: Relative frequencies of MJO events in each of the eight MJO phases. From	
1128	Weisheimer et al. (2014).	43
1129	Figure 4: Power spectra of average sea surface temperature in the Nino 3.4 region in a 135	
1130	year long simulations with the Community Earth System Model. Compared to	
1131	HadISST observations (blue), the simulation has three times more power for	
1132	oscillations with periods between 2 to 4 years (left). When the simulation is repeated	
1133	with the stochastic parameterization SPPT, the temperature variability in this range is	
1134	reduced, leading to a better agreement between the simulated and observed spectra	
1135	(right). From Christensen et al. (2016).	44
1136	Figure 5: Niño 3.4 SST root mean square error (lines) and ensemble spread (dots) according	
1137	to forecast time in EC-Earth 3 seasonal re-forecast experiments initialized in May	
1138	1993-2009 with standard (SR) or high resolution (HR) atmosphere and ocean	
1139	components, with and without activating a 3-scale SPPT perturbation method in the	
1140	atmosphere.	45
1141	Figure 6: Forecast diagnostics as a function of time for the operational (black), fixed	
1142	perturbed parameter (blue) and stochastically varying perturbed parameter (red)	
1143	ensemble forecasts. Top: Forecast bias for (a) T850 and (b) U850 shown as a fraction	
1144	of the bias for the operational system: $\text{BIAS} / \text{BIAS}_{\text{oper}}$. Bottom: Root mean square	
1145	ensemble spread (dashed lines) and root mean square error (solid lines) for (c) T850	
1146	and (d) U850. Diagnostics are averaged over the region 10S-20N, 60-180E. Figure	
1147	adapted from Christensen et al. (2015b).	46
1148	Figure 7: The right tail of the probability density function of summer season hourly	
1149	precipitation from a 50-member ensemble of one year single column model	
1150	simulations with stochastic (blue) and conventional parameterizations (black) and	
1151	fifteen years of observations (green) over a model grid box encompassing the US	

1152	Department of Energy's (DOE) Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM)	
1153	program's site in Lamont, Oklahoma. The large-scale forcing for the single column	
1154	model simulations are generated from a present day CESM simulation at a spatial	
1155	resolution of about $2.8^\circ \times 2.8^\circ$. From Langan et al. (2014).....	47
1156	Figure 8: Maps of the century-mean net upward water flux (mm/day) at the sea surface in	
1157	(a) a control integration of a coupled climate model. (b) Difference from the control	
1158	for an experiment in which the net fresh water flux across the air-sea interface is	
1159	stochastically perturbed before being passed to the ocean. c) Difference from the	
1160	control for an experiment in which the net heat flux across the air-sea interface is	
1161	stochastically perturbed before being passed to the ocean. From Williams (2012)....	48
1162	Figure 9: Top: Amplitude of fluctuations of the eddy forcing as measured by the standard	
1163	deviation of divergence of eddy flux in a $1/10$ degree OGCM. Bottom: Mean eddy	
1164	forcing measured by the magnitude of the mean divergence of eddy heat flux in the	
1165	same heatCM. The amplitude of the fluctuations is about one order of magnitude	
1166	larger than the mean eddy forcing. From Li and von Storch (2013).....	49
1167	Figure 10: Difference in mean standard deviation of sea ice thickness forecasts (meters)	
1168	between ensembles generated by stochastic ice strength as well as atmospheric initial	
1169	perturbations (STOINI) and ensembles generated solely by atmospheric initial	
1170	perturbations (INI), averaged for days (left) 1 to 10, (middle) 11 to 30, and (right) 31	
1171	to 90 after initialization at 00 UTC on 1 January. Stippled areas indicate differences	
1172	statistically significant at the 5% level, using a two-tailed F test. Note the different	
1173	contour intervals. From Juricke et al. (2014).....	50
1174	Figure 11: Histograms of the subgrid cloud-base mass flux, resulting from the stochastic	
1175	shallow cumulus cloud scheme (STOCH) and coarse-grained large-eddy simulation	
1176	(LES), are compared for three horizontal grid resolutions of 1.6 km, 3.2 km and 12.8	
1177	km. From Sakradzija et al. (2015).....	51
1178	Figure 12: Snapshot of the spatial field of convective states obtained from Large Eddy	
1179	Simulation data. The distinction between the various convective states was based on	
1180	cloud top height and rainwater content. From Dorrestijn et al. (2013a).....	52
1181	Figure 13: Climate responses of global mean temperature to a CO ₂ doubling (2x CO ₂	
1182	minus 1x CO ₂) obtained from the ECHAM5/MPIOM-experiments with different	
1183	representations of small-scale fluctuations: 'diffus' refers to experiments in which the	
1184	strength of horizontal diffusion is varied; 'noise' refers to experiments in which white	
1185	noise is added to small scales of the atmospheric model ECHAM5. From Seiffert and	
1186	von Storch (2008).....	53
1187	Figure 14: (Left) The response in mean streamfunction variance of a barotropic-vorticity-	
1188	equation to an anomalous vorticity forcing at latitude 45N and longitude 210E	
1189	projected onto 90 EOFs (left), the simulation of this response by a (middle) 90-EOF	
1190	climate model with unmodified SGS parameterization (relative error 0.527), and by a	
1191	(right) climate model with SGS parameterization corrected by FDT (relative error	
1192	0.342).....	54
1193	Figure 15: Top: Comparison of the upper level kinetic energy spectra of a two level	
1194	benchmark simulation (dashed line) with associated LES (solid line) at various	
1195	resolutions for: atmospheric isotropic stochastic (isoS) LES (top spectra); atmospheric	
1196	isotropic deterministic (isoD) LES (second spectra); atmospheric deterministic scaling	
1197	law (lawD) LES (third spectra); oceanic stochastic scaling law (lawS) LES (forth	

1198	spectra); and oceanic deterministic scaling law LES (bottoms spectra).Top spectra has	
1199	the correct kinetic energy, with the others shifted down for clarity. From Kitsios et al.	
1200	(2014)......	55
1201		




Figure 1: System characterized by a,c) double-potential or e,g) single-potential well and their associated probability density functions (PDFs). If the noise is sufficiently small (a) and under appropriate initial conditions, the system will stay in the deeper potential well and the associated probability density function of states will have a single maximum (b). As the amplitude of the noise increases, the system can undergo a noise-transition and reach the secondary minimum in the potential (c) leading to a shifted mean and increased variance in the associated probability density function (d). A linear system characterized by a single potential well and forced by additive white noise (e) will have a unimodal PDF. However, when forced by mutliplicative (state-dependent) white noise (g), the noise-induced changes the single-well potential of the unforced system, so that the effective potential including the effects of the multiplicative noise has multiple wells and the associated PDF becomes bimodal (h).

OLR bias DJF 1981-2010




Figure 2: Top of the atmosphere net longwave radiation (outgoing longwave radiation; OLR) in W m^{-2} in DJF. Left: *stochphysOFF*–ERA-Interim reanalysis, middle: System 4–reanalysis, right: System 4 – *stochphysOFF*. Significant differences at the 95% confidence level based on a two-sided *t*-test are hatched. From Weisheimer et al. (2014).

1204




Figure 3: Relative frequencies of MJO events in each of the eight MJO phases. From Weisheimer et al. (2014).

1205




Figure 4: Power spectra of average sea surface temperature in the Nino 3.4 region in a 135 year long simulations with the Community Earth System Model. Compared to HadISST observations (blue), the simulation has three times more power for oscillations with periods between 2 to 4 years (left). When the simulation is repeated with the stochastic parameterization SPPT, the temperature variability in this range is reduced, leading to a better agreement between the simulated and observed spectra (right). From Christensen et al. (2016).

1206




Figure 5: Niño 3.4 SST root mean square error (lines) and ensemble spread (dots) according to forecast time in EC-Earth 3 seasonal re-forecast experiments initialized in May 1993-2009 with standard (SR) or high resolution (HR) atmosphere and ocean components, with and without activating a 3-scale SPPT perturbation method in the atmosphere.




Figure 6: Forecast diagnostics as a function of time for the operational (black), fixed perturbed parameter (blue) and stochastically varying perturbed parameter (red) ensemble forecasts. Top: Forecast bias for (a) T850 and (b) U850 shown as a fraction of the bias for the operational system: $\text{BIAS} / \text{BIAS}_{\text{oper}}$. Bottom: Root mean square ensemble spread (dashed lines) and root mean square error (solid lines) for (c) T850 and (d) U850. Diagnostics are averaged over the region 10S-20N, 60-180E. Figure adapted from Christensen et al. (2015b).




Figure 7: The right tail of the probability density function of summer season hourly precipitation from a 50-member ensemble of one year single column model simulations with stochastic (blue) and conventional parameterizations (black) and fifteen years of observations (green) over a model grid box encompassing the US Department of Energy's (DOE) Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) program's site in Lamont, Oklahoma. The large-scale forcing for the single column model simulations are generated from a present day CESM simulation at a spatial resolution of about $2.8^{\circ} \times 2.8^{\circ}$. From Langan et al. (2014).




Figure 8: Maps of the century-mean net upward water flux (mm/day) at the sea surface in (a) a control integration of a coupled climate model. (b) Difference from the control for an experiment in which the net fresh water flux across the air-sea interface is stochastically perturbed before being passed to the ocean. (c) Difference from the control for an experiment in which the net heat flux across the air-sea interface is stochastically perturbed before being passed to the ocean. From Williams (2012).




Figure 9: Top: Amplitude of fluctuations of the eddy forcing as measured by the standard deviation of divergence of eddy flux in a 1/10 degree OGCM. Bottom: Mean eddy forcing measured by the magnitude of the mean divergence of eddy heat flux in the same heatCM. The amplitude of the fluctuations is about one order of magnitude larger than the mean eddy forcing. From Li and von Storch (2013).

STD difference STOINI-INI




Figure 10: Difference in mean standard deviation of sea ice thickness forecasts (meters) between ensembles generated by stochastic ice strength as well as atmospheric initial perturbations (STOINI) and ensembles generated solely by atmospheric initial perturbations (INI), averaged for days (left) 1 to 10, (middle) 11 to 30, and (right) 31 to 90 after initialization at 00 UTC on 1 January. Stippled areas indicate differences statistically significant at the 5% level, using a two-tailed F test. Note the different contour intervals. From Juricke et al. (2014).

1216

1217

1218




Figure 11: Histograms of the subgrid cloud-base mass flux, resulting from the stochastic shallow cumulus cloud scheme (STOCH) and coarse-grained large-eddy simulation (LES), are compared for three horizontal grid resolutions of 1.6 km, 3.2 km and 12.8 km. From Sakradzija et al. (2015).

1219




Figure 12: Snapshot of the spatial field of convective states obtained from Large Eddy Simulation data. The distinction between the various convective states was based on cloud top height and rainwater content. From Dorrestijn et al. (2013a).

1220




Figure 13: Climate responses of global mean temperature to a CO₂ doubling (2x CO₂ minus 1x CO₂) obtained from the ECHAM5/MPIOM-experiments with different representations of small-scale fluctuations: 'diffus' refers to experiments in which the strength of horizontal diffusion is varied; 'noise' refers to experiments in which white noise is added to small scales of the atmospheric model ECHAM5. From Seiffert and von Storch (2008).




Figure 14: (Left) The response in mean streamfunction variance of a barotropic-vorticity-equation to an anomalous vorticity forcing at latitude 45N and longitude 210E projected onto 90 EOFs (left), the simulation of this response by a (middle) 90-EOF climate model with unmodified SGS parameterization (relative error 0.527), and by a (right) climate model with SGS parameterization corrected by FDT (relative error 0.342)

1222

1223




Figure 15: Top: Comparison of the upper level kinetic energy spectra of a two level benchmark simulation (dashed line) with associated LES (solid line) at various resolutions for: atmospheric isotropic stochastic (isoS) LES (top spectra); atmospheric isotropic deterministic (isoD) LES (second spectra); atmospheric deterministic scaling law (lawD) LES (third spectra); oceanic stochastic scaling law (lawS) LES (forth spectra); and oceanic deterministic scaling law LES (bottoms spectra). Top spectra has the correct kinetic energy, with the others shifted down for clarity. From Kitsios et al. (2014).

1224